

**GOODBYE TO PROJECTS?  
THE INSTITUTIONAL IMPACTS OF A LIVELIHOOD APPROACH ON  
DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS**

**RESEARCH PROJECT NO. R7908**

**DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**WORKING PAPER SERIES**

Paper No 11

**A livelihoods-grounded audit of the  
Training for Environmental and  
Agricultural Management (TEAM)  
project in Lesotho**

By Joe Marumo, Tsiliso Tamasane and Ian  
Goldman  
September 2003

---

**ISBN:** 1 898828 52 0  
Published by: Bradford Centre for International Development, University of Bradford,  
Pemberton Building, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD7 1DP  
Tel: +44-1274 233980 Fax: +44-1274 235280  
[www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid](http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid)

## BACKGROUND TO PROJECT AND WORKING PAPER SERIES

This paper is one in a series of working papers prepared under a research project entitled *Goodbye to Projects? The Institutional Impacts of a Livelihood Approach on development interventions*.

This is a collaborative project between the Bradford Centre for International Centre for Development<sup>1</sup> (BCID) with the Economic and Policy Research Centre (EPRC), Uganda; Khanya – managing rural change, South Africa; and, Mzumbe University (formerly the Institute for Development Management (IDM)), Tanzania. The project is supported by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) under their Economic and Social Research Programme (ESCOR).

Approaches to projects and development have undergone considerable change in the last decade with significant policy shifts on governance, gender, poverty eradication, and environmental issues. Most recently this has led to the adoption and promotion of the sustainable livelihood (SL) approach. The adoption of the SL approach presents challenges to development interventions including: the future of projects and programmes, and sector wide approaches (SWAPs) and direct budgetary support.

This project intends to undertake an innovative review of these issues. Central to this will be to question how a livelihood approach is actually being used in a range of development interventions. This will be used to identify and clarify the challenges to the design, appraisal and implementation of development interventions and changes required from the adoption of a livelihoods approach.

The research was conducted in two phases. The first phase consisted of general and country reviews on SL and development interventions. The second phase of the research involved the compilation of ten detailed case studies of development interventions in Uganda, Tanzania and South Africa. These case studies compare and contrast the implementation of a range of sector wide approaches, programmes and projects all developed with a livelihoods-orientation.

Each case study intervention was examined through what might be termed as a ‘sustainable livelihoods (SL)-grounded audit’, which uses sustainable livelihoods ‘principles’ as the basis. The results of this analysis offer useful guidance on the opportunities and challenges faced by development practitioners in operationalizing sustainable livelihoods approaches.

**This paper ‘A livelihoods-grounded audit of the ‘Training for Environmental and Agricultural Management (TEAM) project in Lesotho’ is the eleventh in the series of project working papers.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Formerly Development and Project Planning Centre (DPPC)

*This research is funded by the Department for International Development of the United Kingdom. However, the findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this paper are entirely those of the author(s) and should not be attributed to the Department for International Development, which does not guarantee their accuracy and can accept no responsibility for any consequences of their use.*

## **THE AUTHORS**

**Joe Marumo was a Founder-Director of Khanya-managing rural change and is now Strategic Executive Director for Community Development in Motheo District Municipality, Bloemfontein, South Africa**

**Tsiliso Tamasane is a Consultant working with Khanya-managing rural change in South Africa.**

**Ian Goldman is a Founder-Director of Khanya-managing rural change**

## **PROJECT WORKING PAPERS TO DATE**

- 1. Annotated bibliography on livelihood approaches and development interventions.**
- 2. Appraisal of the use of livelihoods approaches in South Africa.**
- 3. Review of approaches to development interventions in Tanzania: From projects to livelihoods approaches.**
- 4. Review of development interventions and livelihoods approaches in Uganda**
- 5. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Participatory Planning for District Development within Capacity 21 programme (Tanzakesho) in Tanzania**
- 6. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Community-Based Planning (CBP) action research project in South Africa.**
- 7. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Agricultural Sector Programme Support (ASPS) in Tanzania.**
- 8. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Sustainable Management of the Usangu Wetland and its Catchment (SMUWC) project in Tanzania.**
- 9. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Magu District Livelihoods and Food Security Project (MDLFSP) in Tanzania.**

- 10. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Sexual Health and Rights Programme (SHARP!) in Lesotho and South Africa.**
- 11. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Training for Environmental and Agricultural Management (TEAM) project in Lesotho.**
- 12. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Sustainable Coastal Livelihoods Programme (SCLP) in South Africa.**
- 13. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) in Uganda**
- 14. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the AIDS/STD programme in Uganda.**

*For more details on the project, this paper, and others in the series, please contact the UK or African co-ordinators:*

Tom Franks or Anna Toner, BCID, University of Bradford, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD1 7DP, UK Tel: +44 (0) 1274 235286; Fax: +44 (0) 1274 235280; email: [t.r.franks@bradford.ac.uk](mailto:t.r.franks@bradford.ac.uk) or [a.l.toner@bradford.ac.uk](mailto:a.l.toner@bradford.ac.uk) ; [www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid](http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid)

Ian Goldman or Tsiliso Tamasane, Khanya – managing rural change, 17 James Scott Street, Brandwag, Bloemfontein 9301, Free State, South Africa. Tel +27 (0)51 430 8314; Fax: 27 (0)51 430 8322; email: [goldman@khanya-mrc.co.za](mailto:goldman@khanya-mrc.co.za) or [tsiliso@khanya-mrc.co.za](mailto:tsiliso@khanya-mrc.co.za) [www.khanya-mrc.co.za](http://www.khanya-mrc.co.za)

Fred Muhumuza, EPRC, Makerere University Campus, 51 Pool Road, PO Box 7841, Kampala, Uganda. Tel: +256 (0)41 541023; Fax: +256 (0)41 541022; email: [muhuma@hotmail.com](mailto:muhuma@hotmail.com)

Faustin Kamuzora, Mzumbe University, P.O. Box 397, Morogoro, Tanzania. Tel: +255 (0)23 604380; Fax: +255 (0)23 4382; email: [frkamuzora@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:frkamuzora@yahoo.co.uk)

For more details on the project and copies of recent publications please consult the project's web site:

<http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/dppc/GTP/goodbye/html>

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. An SL-grounded audit approach</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2. TEAM- the case study</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 Description of the intervention	10
2.2 Impact	12
2.3 Poor people as focus	12
2.4 Participation	13
2.5 Partnership	13
2.6 Holistic approach	14
2.7 Policy and institutional links	14
2.8 Building on strengths	15
2.9 Dynamic and flexible	15
2.10 Accountability/responsiveness	16
2.11 Sustainability	16
2.12 Critical factors	17
<b>References</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix 2.1</b> TEAM development timeline	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix 2.2</b> People interviewed	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix 2.3</b> Summary of progress against outputs (drawn from the evaluation report).	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix 2.4</b> Lesotho environmental context	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix 2.5</b> TEAM Logical Framework	<b>25</b>

## 1. The SL-grounded audit of development interventions

The cases studies in this research were chosen for inclusion following a first phase review of the use of livelihoods approaches in Tanzania, Uganda and Southern Africa. Data was collected using a number of methods including questionnaires, semi-structured individual and focus group interviews, collection and review of process documentation and workshop activity.

All ten case studies have been analysed according to what we term a ‘SL-grounded audit’ described below so that the emerging lessons can be compared. Each study is divided into two sections: the first a general introduction to the intervention; and the second, a structured response to a series of questions adapted from the SL-principles as defined by Carney (2002) in Box 1. SL principles are one element of sustainable livelihoods approaches. This research adopts these principles as a structuring tool and as means of pinpointing the practical implications of adopting a sustainable livelihoods approach to development.

### **Box 1. SLA principles defined by Carney (2002)**

Sustainable livelihoods approaches: Progress and possibilities for change, p14-15, London: Department for International Development

Normative principles:

**People-centred:** sustainable poverty elimination requires respect for human freedom and choice. People- rather than the resources, facilities or services they use- are the priority concern. This may mean supporting resource management or good governance, for example but the underlying motivation of supporting livelihoods should determine the shape and purpose of action.

**Empowering:** change should result in an amplified voice opportunities and well-being for the poor.

**Responsive and participatory:** poor people must be key actors in identifying and addressing livelihood priorities. Outsiders need processes that enable them to listen and respond to the poor.

**Sustainable:** there are four key dimensions to sustainability-economic, institutional, social and environmental sustainability. All are important-a balance must be found between them.

Operational principles:

**Multi-level and holistic:** micro-level activity and outcomes should inform the development of policy and an effective governance environment. Macro- and meso-level structures should support people to build on their strengths.

**Conducted in partnership:** partnerships can be formed with poor people and their organisations, as well as with public and private sector. Partnerships should be transparent agreements based upon shared goals.

**Disaggregated:** it is vital to understand how assets, vulnerabilities, voice and livelihood strategies differ between disadvantaged groups as well as between men and women in these groups. Stakeholder and gender analysis are key tools.

**Long-term and flexible:** poverty reduction requires long-term commitment and a flexible approach to providing support.

Each case study follows the structure detailed below:

**Description of the intervention:** this includes a chronological description of the evolution of the particular intervention and details the main stakeholders and activities undertaken in implementation. Original logframes and planning documents have been reviewed where possible.

**Impact:** Assessment of the impact of interventions relates to the success or failure of an intervention to achieve the outputs or outcomes that were the main focus of the intervention. The effect of this is that our understanding of impact is somewhat limited and partial. The methodology used in this research project did not allow for significant impact assessment with intervention beneficiaries at the micro-level (although this was done on a small-scale in most of the case studies). This section also includes some assessment of the costs of the intervention balanced against the number of people who benefit from it.

### **Poor People as focus**

Do, or did, the objectives of the intervention include a mention of people and their livelihoods?

How central is this to the intervention's objectives?

How much were household livelihoods a focus during implementation?

### **Participation**

What type of participation was used at each stage of design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?

How and when did this participation occur?

What incentives were there for people to participate?

### **Partnerships**

What was the type of partnership and collaboration between these organisations at micro-meso-macro?

Who owned the project?

### **Holistic approach**

How holistic was the analysis used in design?

How does the plan for the intervention fit into the broader development plan?

How does the intervention coordinate with other development interventions in the area?

### **Policy and institutional links**

How integrated was the intervention with existing institutional structures?

What evidence is there that the intervention addressed linkages between policy at micro, meso and macro levels and across sectors?

### **Building on strengths**

Does the intervention build on existing strengths at the different levels?

### **Dynamic and flexible**

Did the objectives and activities of the intervention change to respond to a changing environment and/or demands?

What further interventions have arisen from the intervention? How did this take place?

### **Accountability/ responsiveness**



How were those implementing the intervention accountable to the public and intervention's beneficiaries?

Who reports to whom and what about?

Do beneficiaries (micro) or partners (meso) have an influence on the intervention and how?

### **Sustainability**

#### Economic

Is the system able to be sustained financially?

Are the "technologies/services" economically viable for beneficiaries?

#### Social

Are vulnerable groups able to access and use effectively the systems of the intervention?

Are the institutions created/used by the intervention able to sustain themselves beyond the life of the intervention?

#### Environmental

Are the technologies/services environmentally beneficial?

Are the systems (meso level) beneficial/neutral?

#### Institutionally

Are the capacities and systems established in such a way so that the system will continue (beyond the life of the intervention)?

Will they continue to generate the outcomes envisaged?

### **Critical factors**

What were critical factors affecting the performance of this intervention?

### **Comparing Cases**

Each case study can be read as a stand-alone document as the SL-grounded audit is in itself a useful means of understanding the strengths and weaknesses of an intervention. However, the broader aim of this research is to compare lessons across all ten case studies in order to identify more generally the challenges and opportunities faced by development practitioners in operationalising a sustainable livelihoods approach.

## 2.0 Training for Environmental and Agricultural Management (TEAM) project in Lesotho

---

### 2.1 Description of the intervention

Training for Environmental and Agricultural Management (TEAM) is a rural livelihoods project that has developed an extension approach that increases the knowledge and improves the practices of rural farmers, including their decision-making and problem-solving abilities. The Project is based on the principles of participation, experiential and adult learning, using teams and self-directed staff (Khanya, 1999).

The Norwegian government (NORAD) funded the first two-year phase of the (TEAM) Project (1995-97). The first phase (1997-1999) of the Pilot Project was funded by DFID, which was extended from 2000 to 2002 to ensure the pilot project was able to deliver and show learnings (CARE, 2000). According to the Project Document (CARE, 2000), the TEAM Pilot extension (2000 - 2002) was to focus on understanding the problems faced by, and opportunities available to, the poorest and most vulnerable rural households, and influencing the development of innovative extension approaches that empower rural farmers to improve their livelihood strategies.

Primary focus will be on the extended phase of the Pilot Project (2000-2002). The timeline of the project is attached in Annex 1. The project closed in December 2002.

According to the project's logical framework (see Appendix 2.3), the project's goal is 'to develop regional methodologies for improvement of rural livelihoods'. The purpose of the TEAM II extension is 'to facilitate the empowerment of vulnerable households in Quthing and Molepolole districts of Lesotho'. Main outputs of the project include:

- 1 Community interest groups that enhance the ability of poor and vulnerable households to improve their livelihood strategies are promoted, supported and co-ordinated;
- 2 Viable linkages for meeting rural households' services support needs are facilitated and established;
- 3 Improved agricultural strategies for households participating in experiential learning activities;
- 4 Constraints to participation and uptake of project activities, especially among the poorest and most vulnerable households identified, understood and alleviated;
- 5 National and regional networking linkages for the purpose of sharing experiences and strengthening social empowerment approaches to poverty alleviation are developed.

Project activities can be elaborated upon through its components:

1. **Institutional Strengthening** works with existing community-based organisations (CBOs) of a social and economic nature including burial societies, retrenched miners

involved in economic activities, anti-stock theft organisations, among others. They have a broad range of members across all livelihoods categories;

2. **Experiential Learning** was practised in 210 villages through a farmer extension facilitator (FEF) in each village. The participants are mainly crop and vegetable farmers that are interested and attend the module facilitation sessions run by TEAM and the FEFs;
3. **The Marketing** component has worked with a total of 130 marketing representatives (MRs) some of whom are FEFs. Most MRs are the average to better-off people in the village who may have an agricultural surplus to market, or are engaged in business enterprise;
4. **Training Materials Design (TMD) Component** is responsible for the design and development of the modules including: experiential learning, institutional strengthening and marketing. TMD are also responsible for the training of FEFs and MRs (training of trainers), and have been involved in trainings for other organisations such as Participatory Learning for Action (PLA) training of stakeholder organisations;
5. **Research and Information Component** is responsible for the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system and wider learning, both within and outside the project as well as consolidating research and survey information brought in by other components into a cohesive picture of development and progress in TEAM.

The primary stakeholders are the local farmers. Various Government departments play a strategic role in this intervention. These include:

- The Ministry of Agriculture, Co-operatives and Land Reclamation;
- The Ministry of Local Government;
- The Ministry of Information, Trade and Marketing.

There are other stakeholders who play a minor role in the intervention, some of whom are NGOs who operate in the districts of Quthing and Mohale's Hoek. They include:

- Lesotho Fund for Community Development (LFCD);
- World Vision;
- National Extension Working Group (NEWG) of MoA and the;
- National University of Lesotho (NUL).

The beneficiaries of the intervention are poor Basotho households that reside in the 210 villages of Mohale's Hoek and Quthing districts. According to the 2002 evaluation report, 58% of regular participating households were from the poor and very poor categories. The Ministry of Agriculture, Co-operatives and Land Reclamation in Lesotho stands to gain exposure to new innovative extension approach through this pilot project. Already TEAM's methodology has been incorporated in MOACLR's extension system.

The first phase of the DFID-funded TEAM Pilot Project (1997-1999) received funding of £959,013 (CARE: Lesotho 1997). The second phase (1999-2000) received funding of £868,409 (CARE: Lesotho, April 2000).

## **2.2 Impact**

According to the recently completed baseline survey study report (Magrath, 2002), TEAM does seem to have had a substantial positive impact in the agricultural sector. The report states that although the proportion of participants who have moved up to a new livelihood category as a result of TEAM is likely to be low, there have been widespread increases in production, at least for garden crops, and consequent unproved food security and nutrition and increased marketing incomes.

Further, Magrath (2002) reports that there is some evidence that CARE has also has an impact in the area of farmer decision-making, and encouraging farmers to share ideas and to experiment with agricultural practices. However, Magrath warns that it is too early to say whether these changes will be sustained in future or be applied to new areas of innovation.

Regarding the Marketing component, Magrath argues that while there is clearly a demand for assistance in marketing, the impact of this component has been limited as the Marketing Representatives have not had time to disseminate their training. The Institutional strengthening is reported to have had impact in some villages (Magrath, 2002).

Finally, the baseline survey study report states that three out of four Purpose Indicator Targets which were assessed have been reached.

The TEAM project's strength has been its use of locally available resources – people and their resources/assets, thus building on existing strengths. The TEAM project worked closely with poor rural households building capacities through training.

Locally elected Farmer Extension Facilitators (FEFs) facilitated the training sessions. FEFs conduct experiments and refine technologies with the interest groups and individuals within the villages. They serve as the contact people for CARE and their activities in the village. Through the Marketing component TEAM has built community members' capacity to access markets for their produce, by establishing internal markets and linking with external ones. Marketing Representatives (MR) were elected and trained as facilitators of small business skills modules.

TEAM's field staff has also received training in a number of different participatory methodologies. In addition, CARE has development management systems for self-directed teams and participatory decision-making. TEAMs intervention is highly empowering, both to the project staff and participants.

## **2.3 Poor People as focus**

TEAM is a livelihoods project. It explicitly included a mention of livelihoods in its objectives, and a number of the Sustainable Livelihoods principles are being adhered to.

The extent of livelihoods centrality to the TEAM project is demonstrated in the project's outputs. For example, through output 1 TEAM aims to promote, support and co-ordinate community interest groups, which enhances the ability of poor and vulnerable households

to improve their livelihood strategies. In addition, output 3 aims to improve agricultural strategies for households participating in experiential learning activities

TEAMS main thrust of work has been capacity building and empowerment of the rural poor and the institutions with which they work, such as CBOs. Poor received training on improved farming practices, access to markets, and how to run their CBOs. The aim of these endeavours is to assist households to better their livelihoods. Thus the project is creating an enabling environment for communities to fight poverty and underdevelopment, that is, to effect change on people's livelihoods.

## **2.4 Participation**

Project beneficiaries participated in the implementation of the project by attending regular training modules, action research and other PRA activities. However, the latest review has discovered that attendance of experiential learning modules declined towards the end of the second phase of the project. This is attributed to the fact that TEAM provided training on innovative forms of agricultural practices, but no agricultural inputs. Participants became discouraged and stopped attending as they could not practise what they had learned, since many were too poor to afford to buy inputs. Some households did not have access to agricultural land. Some found TEAM methodologies to be relevant mainly to backyard gardens, not their main fields (Khanya 1999; Khanya 2002).

The concept of Participatory Village Self-Monitoring (PVSM) facilitated communities' participation in the monitoring and evaluation of the project. PVSM is a system developed by TEAM to increase capacity of participating CBOs and villagers to plan, manage, and monitor their village initiatives. PVSM was hailed as a very good process as people are able to learn for themselves and make improvements, although it was complex and not well understood by staff (Khanya 1999). This process did not receive sufficient attention in the second phase of the project. In both the 1999 and 2002 reviews, the review teams consulted with the project staff, project beneficiaries as well as government employees of relevant Ministries.

In sum, beneficiaries' participation was characterised by passiveness at the design level with active involvement at the implementation, and monitoring and evaluation levels.

## **2.5 Partnerships**

TEAM is rural based with a major agricultural component. Therefore, it works within a policy and institutional environment dominated by the Ministry of Agriculture, Cooperatives and Land Reclamation (MOACLR), who are potentially the major partner in terms of sharing methodologies. The partnership between CARE and the Ministry was good at national level, especially at the conception stage.

In the beginning MOACLR and CARE worked well together, with MOACLR staff joining CARE on initial PRAs. The highlight was the joint development of the Unified Extension Approach which MOACLR adopted as extension policy, where CARE was a member of National Extension Working Group. The original intention was for the two role players to work closely throughout the project cycle. The lack of political

commitment and political instability of 1998 hampered the working relationship, to the end. Moreover, there was a very poor working relationship at district level.

TEAM had a working relationship with other organisations such as Sechaba Consultants and the National University of Lesotho, especially on methodological issues. TEAM's involvement with Bio-Africa, through growing essential oils (GEO farming) was an interesting pilot, but it diverted TEAM away from its poverty focussed, empowering, participatory approach, towards engaging with the richer, more able farmers, and 'doing things' for farmers (e.g. providing seedlings, credit, advice and a single channel market). This has however been a useful learning pilot for the project, the participating farmers and Bio-Africa and may well be an enterprise that develops in the future (Khanya 2002).

## **2.6 Holistic approach**

TEAM has attempted to accommodate holism in its approach. Although this objective has to a large extent been ignored, one of TEAM's initial objectives has been to train people or raise farmers' awareness on issues of conservation, land reclamation, control of soil erosion, and the management of agricultural and natural resources (CARE 1997).

Initial active involvement of relevant Ministries of the Government of Lesotho (GOL), particularly MOACLR, MOLG and MITM, demonstrates TEAM's willingness and attempt to link its project with other development interventions in the area. Sadly, this collaborative effort lasted for a very short time. This has been attributed largely to the lack of political commitment on the part of the GOL and the political instability/changes in that country.

TEAM's involvement with Bio-Africa, through growing essential oils (GEO farming) is another case in point. However, TEAM's endeavours at holism have also been the grounds of its criticisms. Reviewers argued that TEAM took on too many functions, which ultimately proved too difficult to comprehend and implement. Furthermore, attempts at holism in implementation in the end made it over complex and took focus away from FEFs.

## **2.7 Policy and institutional links**

TEAM has been key in the development of the new Unified Extension Approach for MOACLR, and has played a part in the development of the functions of the District Planning Unit (DPU) of MOLG (Khanya 2002). Both the unified extension and DPU are unable to move to implementation due to political and organisation problems. Sharing activities in the form of three symposia and three market days have been carried out and have generated much interest from organisations in Lesotho, especially towards the end of this phase (Khanya 2002).

With output 6, TEAM wishes to develop national and regional networking linkages for the purpose of sharing experiences and strengthening social empowerment approaches to poverty alleviation. Although there has been increasing momentum in achieving this output towards the end of the project, TEAM has experienced difficulty in engaging stakeholders in the project in spite of numerous strategies and functions. However, it

needs to be realised that this output was not considered that important at the beginning of the project (phase 1), and was therefore difficult to get stakeholders on board at a later stage especially considering the current political and policy environment in both MOLG and MOACLR.

On the other hand at meso and macro levels, TEAM has been using its impact on rural people's livelihoods to generate enthusiasm among decision-makers to adopt and adapt such methodologies towards better rural development practice in Lesotho and the Southern African region (Khanya 2002).

## **2.8 Building on strengths**

The TEAM project's strength has been its use of locally available resources – people and their resources, thus building on existing strengths. The TEAM project worked closely with poor rural households building capacities through training. Locally elected Farmer Extension Facilitators (FEFs) facilitate training sessions.

Further, the TEAM project has made use of community interest groups (CIGs) in the experiential component of the project, as well as community based organisations (CBOs) towards improving peoples livelihoods. The use of groups is positive in any extension methodology as it improves the number of people reached as well as generates enthusiasm and systems of support in implementing new technologies. The review report (Khanya 2002) reports that in the project districts, 130 CBOs are participating in the TEAM project, and as a result 35 have received useful training in the management of their organisations. This has begun to manifest in the ability of CBOs to establish linkages with other service providers, and the effect and benefits thereof are felt widely in the villages.

TEAM's field staff has also received training in a number of different participatory methodologies. In addition, CARE has developed management systems for self-directed teams and participatory decision-making. Therefore, TEAM's intervention is empowering, both to the project staff and participants.

## **2.9 Dynamic and flexible**

As stated earlier, the first two-year phase of the Training for Environmental and Agricultural Management (TEAM) Project (1995-97) was funded by the Norwegian government (NORAD). The focus then was on conservation and the management of agricultural and natural resources (ANR). The first phase of DFID-funded TEAM (1997-1999) was designed to test and establish a viable and replicable extension system based on a participatory planning and resource management support process that enables rural households to pursue agreed community priorities (CARE 1997).

The TEAM Pilot extension (2000 - 2002) was to focus on understanding the problems faced by, and opportunities available to, the poorest and most vulnerable rural households, and influencing the development of innovative extension approaches that empower rural farmers to improve their livelihood strategies.

Further, TEAM Pilot extension witnessed the introduction of another two components: Institutional Strengthening and Marketing. Moreover, the extended phase of the project doubled the number of villages. However, this made the project impact on direct beneficiaries too diffuse to have real impact. Khanya (2002) argue that the rationale for the pilot should have been maintained – to work intensely in a smaller area to demonstrate the approaches to and impacts of farmer empowerment.

During its 8 years of existence TEAM changed its focus and approach from time-to-time to accommodate the changing needs of the communities they served, and policy changes of the Government of Lesotho and DFID as donor/funder.

## **2.10 Accountability and responsiveness**

CARE was largely answerable to DFID as the main funder. While working relations between TEAM project and the MOACLR were better nationally the GOL did not feel itself an “owner” of the project and did not participate in the project’s monitoring and evaluation. There was no mechanism created for accountability to beneficiaries.

## **2.11 Sustainability**

### Economic

TEAM has been a very expensive project with a budget of £800,000 (for 1999-2000 phase), with a large number of personnel and large fleet of vehicles. The main bulk of the budget went to salaries and allowances for staff. The project also used the service of expatriate staff who are not cheap. This raises questions about its financial sustainability.

TEAM encouraged project participants to use local technologies to improve crop yields, and better manage the ecosystem. These technologies are not costly at all. Training modules were developed around locally available resources such as kraal manure. The use of locally trained FEFs and MRs has helped to build the capacity of local people and to retain institutional memory in the villages that were covered by the project. Training can therefore carry on with or without TEAM as it cost little to run it. The costly exercise is the development of training material that requires specialized expertise.

### Social

TEAM worked with local community interest groups, community based organisations and individual farmers, building their capacity through training. Members of the CBOs and CIGs have been trained on how to manage effectively their respective organisations, and how to access resources and demand services. Individual farmers have been trained on better farming/cropping methods, and have also been introduced to the working of the markets, and advice offered on how to access these. This training will help concerned individuals to better manage their livelihoods. This knowledge will remain with the group of people under discussion.

### Environmental

Training for Environment and Agricultural Management (TEAM) as its name suggests has also been concerned with issues of environment, conservation, agricultural and



natural resources management. Technologies that were promoted were environmentally friendly. Training materials have also addressed issues of environmental care such as the management of soil erosion and land reclamation.

#### Institutionally

At one point, it looked like TEAM would not have strong linkages with MOACLR, although it influenced the Ministry's Unified Extension System. However, the successor LRAP project is now located within MOACLR, taking the linkage forward.

### **2.12 Critical factors**

The successful aspects of TEAM could be attributed to:

- Its pro-poor focus
- Participatory nature of the programme
- Policy and institutional linkage, particularly at the macro level
- Empowerment approach which the programme adopted

TEAM is dealing with poorer/female-headed households in the villages of Mohale's Hoek and Quthing districts. A household livelihood assessment exercise was conducted to identify the target groups. Participation by beneficiaries especially in the implementation stage of the intervention was critical to its success. Through active participation, the project's beneficiaries were up to date regarding the project's objectives and methodologies. This in a way promoted a sense of ownership among project beneficiaries.

Despite the poor working relationship between TEAM and MOACLR staff at the district level, TEAM worked closely with the headquarters-based staff. The results were strengthened linkage of the TEAM programme to government policy, and improved image (credibility) of TEAM's methodologies. This link to policy, paved the way for TEAM's successor, Livelihoods Recovery through Agriculture Programme (LRAP). LRAP offices are situated in the Ministry's headquarters. This indicates the harmonious relationship between CARE and MOACLR.

Moreover, TEAM demonstrated a considerable degree of flexibility and dynamism. This flexibility and dynamism allowed the programme to adapt to new situations and conditions. However the downside is that TEAM was pulled from many directions, and was in danger of losing its direction.

## References

Bunch, R. (1982). Two Ears of Corn: A Guide to People-Centred Agricultural Improvement. World Neighbours, Oklahoma City.

CARE (2001), Livelihoods in Lesotho. CARE Lesotho, Maseru

CARE (2000). TEAM Livelihoods Security Project. April 2000. CARE Lesotho.

CARE (1997). Training for Environment and Agricultural Management: Pilot Project. May 1997. CARE Lesotho.

Garner, H. (Sept 2001). Output to Purpose Review Social Development Report, DFID

Impact Assessment of TEAM Interventions on Rural Communities Livelihoods in Southern Districts of Lesotho (Quthing & Mohale's Hoek). (undated). CARE Lesotho, Maseru.

Impact Assessment of Experiential Learning of TEAM Project in Mohale's Hoek and Quthing Districts. (Undated). CARE Lesotho, Maseru.

Khanya, (2002). Final Evaluation of the TEAM Project, CARE International in Lesotho. May 2002.

Khanya, (2000). Review of TEAM Project M&E System.

Khanya, (1999). Review of the CARE TEAM Project. October 1999

Mohasi & Turner. (1997-1999). TEAM Project Action Research

Mohasi & Turner. (1999). Training for Environmental and Agricultural Management (TEAM) Pilot Project: Action Research Report

Magrath, P. (2002), TEAM Project Report on Repeat Baseline Survey. CARE Lesotho-South Africa

TEAM Community-based Organisations Training Manual. (undated). CARE Lesotho, Maseru.

TEAM Logical Framework. (2001). CARE Lesotho, Maseru (numerous versions).

TEAM Monitoring & Evaluation Guide. (2000). CARE Lesotho, Maseru.

TEAM participatory Learning & Action: A Guide for PLA Techniques in Lesotho. (undated). CARE Lesotho, Maseru.

TEAM Research & Information Review of Marketing Component 2001-2002. (undated). CARE Lesotho, Maseru.

## Appendix 2.1 TEAM development timeline

Time	Events
<b>1995</b>	
July	Open office in Mohale's Hoek NORAD funding
Sept	Look at UEA. to find ways to improve the methodology for future
Dec	Discussion with MoA – Project Villages
<b>1996</b>	
Feb	Agriculture staff from Mafeteng (DAO) joined the project. New staff joined - TEAM project launching
Dec	Trained on PRA Extension methodology by Mike Drinkwater Collaboration with other funding agencies.
<b>1997</b>	
Oct	DFID Funding of project
<b>1998</b>	
May	Modules designed
June	Trained on Facilitation skills Design of 1 <sup>st</sup> set of technical modules
Oct	Assisting other NGOs with PRA New DAO Mohale's Hoek – introducing Team
<b>1999</b>	
Jan 99	Participatory Village Self – Monitoring system launching
March	Review of CARE - Lesotho mission as a whole at RSA
June	Presentation to DFID final results of action research report on livelihoods 2 <sup>nd</sup> Set of modules designed
Nov	Programme Coordinator (Steve Zodrow) leaves CARE
Oct	Recruitment of Programme Coordinator – Rebecca Calder
<b>2000</b>	
July	Beginning of Phase II – new project design Marketing & ISC started in TEAM 1 <sup>st</sup> Symposium held
Sept-Dec	Undertook baseline survey Khanya review logframe and M&E system Changes on the logframe after baseline
<b>2001</b>	
April	1 <sup>st</sup> rural livelihoods symposium Resignation of Project Manager
May	Bio-Africa starts
June	Clearing House established and operational
Aug	Project Manager Makojang Maho employed TEAM OPR conducted
Sept	FEF method in APCBP

	OPR conducted Pilot of 1 <sup>st</sup> rural Market Day
<b>2002</b>	
Jan	2 <sup>nd</sup> rural livelihoods symposium
March	Advocacy of TEAM methodologies to UES Dr Joanne Abbot joined CARE as Livelihoods advisor

## Appendix 2.2 List and contacts of persons and organisations interviewed

	NAME & ORGANISATION		CONTACT NO & E-MAIL
1	`Mamasupha Maama	CARE TEAM PROJECT (Mohale's Hoek)	<a href="mailto:careteam@leo.co.ls">careteam@leo.co.ls</a> 785378 or 750537
2	`Mawhite Lerotholi	CARE TEAM PROJECT	<a href="mailto:careteam@leo.co.ls">careteam@leo.co.ls</a> 785378 or 750537
3	Joanne Abbot	CARE Rural Livelihoods	<a href="mailto:JoAbbot@care.org.ls">JoAbbot@care.org.ls</a> 860698 or 314398
4	Sechaba Mokhameleli	CARE TEAM PROJECT	<a href="mailto:Careteam@leo.co.ls">Careteam@leo.co.ls</a> 785378 or 750537
5	Mohasi Mohasi	CARE TEAM PROJECT	<a href="mailto:Careteam@leo.co.ls">Careteam@leo.co.ls</a> 785378 or 750537
6	Makula Maine	CARE TEAM PROJECT	<a href="mailto:Careteam@leo.co.ls">Careteam@leo.co.ls</a> 785378 or 750537
7	Morongoe Mahanetsa	NUL, FAO	8786316
8	`Mamohau Mokuena	World Vision	Mamohau_mokoena_wvi_org. 317371 or 864552
9	Sipho Ndlovu	MS Lesotho	<a href="mailto:SrprogoH@msles.org.ls">SrprogoH@msles.org.ls</a>
10	Maqalika Matsepe	Agric Information	312330
11	Gift Ntsonyane	CARE TEAM PROJECT	<a href="mailto:Careteam@leo.co.ls">Careteam@leo.co.ls</a> 785378 or 8795636
12	Tshehlo Thulo	Ministry of Local Government	323602 or 8789260
13	Selloane Pitikoe	CARE TEAM PROJECT	<a href="mailto:Careteam@leo.co.ls">Careteam@leo.co.ls</a> 785378 or 8732069
14	`Makojang Mahao	CARE TEAM PROJECT	<a href="mailto:Careteam@leo.co.ls">Careteam@leo.co.ls</a> 785378 or 866746
17	Ntate Khalane	MITM	323868
18	M Mohlomi	Agric	
19	M Mohatla	LESELI – CARE	314398
20	`Mathoriso Molumeli	Agric – Policy and Planning	326235
21	R Hoeninger	DPU – Advisor Ministry of Local Government, M/Hoek	785344 or 8850799
22	Malehloa Moleleki	Ministry of Local Government	322174/323239/8734819

### Appendix 2.3 Summary of progress against outputs (drawn from the evaluation report).

Output	Progress
1 Community interest groups which enhances the ability of poor and vulnerable households to improve their livelihood strategies are promoted, supported and co-ordinated.	None of the OVI's has been achieved so far. The TEAM component focusing on this output is Institutional Strengthening and has only gained momentum towards the end of the project. Thus, it has been difficult to ascertain the impact against this output.
2 Viable linkages for meeting rural households' services support needs are facilitated and established	Most of the indicators for this Output were not properly assessed as Research and Information believed incorrectly that the OVI's associated with this output had only been added to the logframe at the September OPR. However, data collected and aggregated from before the OPR and since indicates some achievement of establishment of linkages (data show 33% of CBOs out of an initial target of 50%).
3 Improved agricultural strategies for households participating in experiential learning activities	In general there has been some adoption of the agricultural technologies, but this has not been widespread, nor generated the energy and enthusiasm for "improved" agriculture as expected.
4 Constraints to participation and uptake of project activities, especially among the poorest and most vulnerable households identified, understood and alleviate	Achievement of this Output is not clear because of the confusing sampling technique used during data collection. However, the M&E information concludes that 58.1% of regular participating households are from the poor and very poor categories.
5 National and regional networking linkages for the purpose of sharing experiences and strengthening social empowerment approaches to poverty alleviation are developed.	Although there has been increasing momentum in achieving this output towards the end of the project, TEAM have experienced difficulty in engaging stakeholders in the project in spite of numerous strategies and functions.

## Appendix 2.4 Lesotho environmental context

In order to conduct an evaluation of the achievements of the TEAM Project it is important to first have an understanding of the environmental context within which the project has been carried out. In a livelihoods context, this context provides the policies, institutions and processes that shape the environment in which TEAM operates, effect the implementation of TEAM approaches, but which TEAM may have only limited ability to influence. Some of these are:

- Political flux. The current political environment in Lesotho is one of uncertainty. This has existed since the political upheaval 1998, and there has not been decisive and strong leadership since that date. This is particularly evident with the policy of decentralisation being led by the Ministry of Local Government, where there appears not to be the political will nor public service leadership to operationalise. This has hampered development efforts to institutionalise and build capacity at district level.
- Viability of agriculture. Lesotho is a small country, and in general has a relatively homogeneous society being of the same ethnic group – Basotho (except for some small pockets of Xhosa-speaking groups). Rural Lesotho is an agricultural society, but although agriculture is central to rural people’s livelihoods, it serves more as a subsistence activity and for cultural reasons than as a commercial enterprise (CARE 2001). Rural Basotho traditionally migrate as a livelihood strategy, either to nearby towns, but more commonly to South Africa in search of employment. The declining economic climate and retrenchment on the mines in South Africa is resulting in the return of many migrant workers (mainly men) to rural areas of Lesotho. This will have the initial impact of injecting new ideas, energy and financial resources into rural areas, but the medium and longer-term impacts are less certain. Considering the role of agriculture in supporting livelihoods, being subsistence and cultural, the wisdom of a farmer empowerment programme without corresponding inputs to improve agricultural practice is questioned
- Climate. Recurring drought and unpredictable climatic conditions make extensive cropping marginal in terms of production, and cultivation is best on a small scale (eg backyard gardens), where there is water for irrigation and is usually vegetables for home and local markets. In such an environment it is difficult to achieve improvements in livelihoods through agriculture where at best production is marginal.
- Development impacts of HIV/AIDS. HIV/AIDS has a negative impact in rural areas resulting in the loss of human resource and the direct impact on families and rural communities. This also impacts upon service providers as a result of staff losses, reduces the capacity of CBOs through ill-health and high turnover rates in their members and leaders, as well as disrupts fieldwork due to funerals
- “Dependency syndrome” During interviews, interviewees frequently referred to “dependency syndrome” – manifested in that rural people do not actively demand

services, but are largely passive recipients of services. This is exacerbated by many of the government programmes, such as those of MOACLR) which include a ploughing service, and will provide rural people with inputs in times of crop failure (which is frequent). This is a difficult social environment in which to try and “empower” communities, especially when your efforts are being thwarted by organisations operating with the same communities in a paternalistic manner.

- Agricultural policy environment. TEAM, being rural based and having an agricultural component, works within a policy and institutional environment dominated by the Ministry of Agriculture, Cooperatives and Land Reclamation (MOACLR), as well as potentially being their major partner in terms of sharing methodologies. The MOACLR has three main objectives:
  - Reduction of poverty
  - Increase in food security; and
  - The generation of employment in a sustainable manner.

The implementation of these objectives is through: increased productivity; A suitable enabling environment for agriculture; and increasing awareness of the management of natural resources. These objectives are close to those of TEAM, however there appears to be little capacity to implement. To assist in achieving the above, the Agriculture Policy and Capacity Building Programme (APCBP) has been initiated within MOACLR, with the objectives of:

- Assisting to redefine the core public roles of the MOACLR;
- Facilitating increased private sector participation in agriculture support services; and
- To build public sector capacity to provide target oriented, client responsive agricultural services.

APCBP has four components:

1. Sector strategy and management (policy, planning, budgeting, and M&E)
2. Agriculture support services (extension, research, marketing, facilitation & technical services);
3. Land management and administration (policy, information and planning)
4. Change process management (institutional restructuring, HRM, financial management, privatisation and divestiture).

This is an ideal project for the learnings from TEAM to be mainstreamed through MOACLR. However, although both MOACLR and APCBP have their own implementation problems, both CARE and DFID (that part fund APCBP) were not able to secure a more formal space for TEAM and its learnings in the project.

- Difficult terrain. Although the country is small, the mountainous terrain combined with poor infrastructure and communications makes access by service providers to a large proportion of rural people difficult. This provides a challenge for any government or non-government service provider, but was faced by TEAM, particularly in its expanded operational area.

- Weak partnerships. Despite the field challenges, Government and a large number of organisations are involved in rural development. Lesotho has a long history of donor support and NGO work and an institutional memory within the donor community of many lessons learned and experience to draw from for future development assistance. But the inherent negative government/NGO project dynamic usually results in weak partnerships and little cooperation and open sharing of learnings. This manifests with often parallel project implementation with little direct leadership from within Government.
- Post apartheid Southern Africa. The donor climate of southern Africa has changed much since 1994. The democratisation and liberalisation of South Africa and the movement of donors towards more regional programmes has meant that direct support to Lesotho has decreased.



## Annex 5 TEAM Logical Framework

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<b>Goal:</b> To develop regional methodologies for the improvement of rural livelihoods	Methodologies being adapted in other parts of southern Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project reports</li> <li>• Evaluation reports</li> </ul>	
<b>Purpose:</b> To facilitate the empowerment of poor and vulnerable rural households in Quthing and Mphahle's Hoek Districts of Lesotho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. More than 60% of the 4000 participating households in 200 villages have increased their ability to withstand shocks and stresses by end of project (EoP).</li> <li>ii. More than 75% of participating households demonstrate that their ability to make decisions, manage, and solve problems concerning key livelihood issues has increased by EoP.</li> <li>iii. More than 75% of participating households are participating in Community Interest Groups by EoP.</li> <li>iv. More than 75% of participating households are accessing and using goods, services and information by EoP.</li> <li>v. More than 75% of Community Interest Groups demonstrate increased capacity to develop</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Action research</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> PSM case studies</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> experiential learning records</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> PM&amp;E matrices</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Capacity assessment tool</li> <li>• Project reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Political destabilisation does not force the Project to suspend</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> HIV/Aids pandemic within the region does not dramatically increase the numbers of rural poor (including female-headed households and orphans)</li> </ul>





<p>experiences and strengthening social empowerment approaches to poverty alleviation are developed</p>	<p>experiential learning identify key constraints to participation and uptake, especially among the poorest and most vulnerable households within the first 3 months of the Project.</p> <p>ii. Increased participation the poorest and most vulnerable, in project activities within the first 6 months of the Project.</p> <p>iii. Increased uptake of project activities among the poorest and most vulnerable households by the end of Year 1.</p> <p>i. Practical working linkages with CARE South Africa's SCAPE programme and a minimum of three of their major network partners are established by end of Year 1.</p> <p>ii. Networking linkages with relevant CARE, DFID and other agency projects within the region are established by end of Year 1.</p> <p>iii. Linkages for the sharing of key learning between the TEAM PILOT PHASE II Project and at least five other projects within Lesotho are established within the first 6 months of the Project.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Project and mission records and documentation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Meeting minutes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Workshop reports</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Trip reports</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Reports and documentation from other projects and from DFID-SA</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Other projects and organisations are willing to collaborate and share experiences with the TEAM PILOT PHASE II Project</p>
---	--	--	--

